

REMARKS

In view of the preceding amendments and the comments, which follow, and pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.111, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Official Action of June 14, 2004.

Summary

Claims 9 and 11 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced as a result of these amendments. Claims 9 and 11 are pending following entry of the amendments and consideration of the following remarks.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Oross et al. (US 6,757,002 B1). Pending Claim 9 is directed to an input control system comprising an input pad having a coordinate input portion for inputting data and four push type switches.

Amended Claim 9 recites that "data from the input pad and data from each of said four switches are formatted to a common format data", and that "the common format data includes X coordinate and Y coordinate positional information of the input pad, and Z direction information indicating contact strength, and ON or OFF information of each switch, and the common format data is output as a single data item."

In regard to the claimed data formatting feature, Oross is silent about the formatting of the operation data originating from the input data and from each of the push-type switches.

Although, Oross does disclose that in regard to the input pad, a tapping can be detected to correspond to a button "click" or "double click", and that to select one button from the palette the operator taps emulating a single click, (or clicks the clicking button 18). However, Oross fails to disclose or suggest that input pad and data from each of said four switches are formatted to a common format data. Oross, further, fails to disclose or suggest that the common format data includes X coordinate and Y coordinate positional information of the input pad, and Z direction information indicating contact strength, and ON or OFF information of each switch, and the common format data is output as a single data item. Thus, Claim 9 is

allowable over Oross.

The Examiner has further rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Oross et al. in view of Castaneda (US 4,786,895)

In regard to Claim 11, Oross and Castaneda may not be properly combined to reject Claim 11.

Castaneda also fails to teach or suggest input pad and data from each of said four switches are formatted to a common format data. Castaneda, further, fails to disclose or suggest that the common format data includes X coordinate and Y coordinate positional information of the input pad, and Z direction information indicating contact strength, and ON or OFF information of each switch, and the common format data is output as a single data item.

Accordingly the claimed feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by Oross et al. or by Castaneda, either singly or in combination with each other. Thus, Claim 11 is not rendered unpatentable by these prior art references.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of Claims 9 and 11 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, and favorable reconsideration of this application. If, there are additional fees due, Applicant requests that this paper constitutes any necessary petition and authorizes the Commissioner to charge any underpayment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-1925. If the examiner finds that there are any outstanding issues which may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,
Brinks, Hofer, Gilson & Lione

By



Anthony P. Curtis, Ph.D.
Registration No. 46,193

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200